

Amendments to the Drawings:

All of the following changes are implemented on the attached replacement sheets and shown on the annotated sheets showing changes:

- In Figure 1A, block 31 is relabeled as -- MEMORY CONTROLLER--;
- In Figure 1B, block 31 is relabeled as -- MEMORY CONTROLLER CHIP--;
- In Figure 1B, block 40 is relabeled as -- INTERFACE CIRCUIT--;
- In Figure 2, block 31 is relabeled as -- MEMORY CONTROLLER--;
- In Figure 3A, block 233 is relabeled as -- ADDR DEC--;
- In Figure 3A, blocks 211 and 213 are relabeled as --MEMORY SECTOR--;
- In Figure 3B, signal line 235 is relabeled as --FROM ADDRESS DECODER--;
- In Figure 6, the legend of element 31 is relabeled as -- MEMORY CONTROLLER--;
- In Figure 6, block 515 is relabeled as --REC & S/P--;
- In Figure 7, the legend of element 31 is relabeled as -- MEMORY CONTROLLER--;
- In Figure 12, block 1081 is relabeled as --ROW DECODER--;
- In Figure 12, block 1119 is relabeled as --ERASE DECODER--;
- In Figure 17A, block 1415 is relabeled as --PROGRAM DECODER--;
- In Figure 17A, block 1417 is relabeled as --ERASE DECODER--;
- In Figure 17A, element 1111 is relabeled as --INTERNAL ADDRESS BUS--;
- In Figure 17B, the outputs of block 1480 have been respectively relabeled --READ BIT 1—to --
READ BIT L--;

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Communication mailed on January 3, 2007.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action raised a number of objections to the drawings. The drawings have been amended to conform to the comments in the Office Action.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action raised a number of objections to the specification. These have all been attended to as noted above.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Office Action gave an obviousness-type double patenting rejection to claims 63-91 based on US patent 5,991,517, which is the parent of the present application. Although the validity of this rejection has not been considered in detail and thus no conclusion has been reached as to the whether the rejection is well taken or not, a terminal disclaimer is being filed with the present response in order to facilitate the application process.


Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The Office Action has rejected claims 63-91 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over the prior art. But, as noted in the Office Action, this rejection is pending approval of the TC director per MPEP §1003(b).

Since claims 63-91 are exact copies of claims 1-17 and 43-54, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 5,657,270, assigned on its face to Kabushiki Kaisha Toshiba ("Toshiba"), a rejection of these common claims in the present application would, in effect, be a declaration that the Toshiba patent claims are invalid over cited JP Kokai 62-188100. But Toshiba is not able to defend its patent in the prosecution of the present invention. It should also be noted that JP 62-188100 was made of record in the file of Toshiba's U.S. Patent No. 5,657,270, so the common claims have already been allowed over the cited reference and granted to Toshiba.

Declaration of the requested interference with the Toshiba patent is urged, where Toshiba will then be a party to proceedings that may affect the validity of its Patent No. 5,657,270.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald P. Parsons
Reg. No. 24,486

3/22/07

Date

PARSONS HSUE & DE RUNTZ LLP
595 Market Street, Suite 1900
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 318-1160 (main)
(415) 318-1163 (direct)
(415) 693-0194 (fax)